



Marykay Voytilla

To: jstefano@ch2m.com

05/24/2001 04:09 PM

cc: nzilka@nidlink.com, ralston@moscow.com

Subject: Help with Proposed Plan Stuff While I'm Out

[Nick and Dale please see item 5 below]

Jim,

(b) (6)

I'm going to need your help on some proposed plan items while I'm out. Here is a list of things I would like you to do. I'll try to touch base with you (b) (6) early in the week in case you have any questions, or you can reach me at (b) (6) on Tuesday or Wednesday, May 29 and 30.

1. Please touch base with Marianne Deppman (EPA Community Relations Coordinator) at (206) 553-1237 to see if she needs any help with proposed plan graphics or formatting. I gave a revised draft of the proposed plan to Marianne (b) (6). She is going to start formatting the document, adding the figures, and including the community relations pieces. I also asked for her suggestions on where we could cut, consolidate, or reformat information to make the document more user friendly. Attached is a copy of the revised proposed plan that went to Marianne. In addition, I forwarded to you the comments that I received on the document, you should have them on e-mail except for Dale's which I faxed.



proposed plan2.

2. You may hear from Beth Kunz (EPA's web person) while I'm out regarding posting the RI/FS to the website. She was having one little insignificant glitch before I left and I gave her your name and phone number to contact you next week if she needs to.

3. I sent you a separate e-mail about changes that I would like you to make to the power point presentation for the peer review briefing on June 14. I would like to use the revised power point presentation for a separate peer review discussion with Bill Riley (EPA Office of Water) on June 7. See my e-mail.

4. I also sent you a separate message regarding your availability for the meeting with Bill Riley as well as a Bunker Hill Task Force meeting on June 7 in the evening. See my e-mail.

5. I took a stab at revising the proposed plan (PP) based on comments from the technical team. I was not able to address all comments however, and I'd like your help with some of the more technical issues as indicated below. While I was revising the PP, I worked with Nick on some questions that I had about how best to incorporate some of the commenters concerns. Nick indicated that Dale would be willing to work further with us if needed. I would like to take him up on that. Here's what I'd like you and Dale to do. If you can get together next week (week of May 28) that would give us the best chance of staying on schedule.

a. Dale, Bill, Nick and TerraGraphics all had some concerns regarding the text in section titled "Characteristics of the Bunker Hill Mine Water Management System." I revised as best I could but I think you would have a better handle on rewording for accuracy. Please review their comments and prepare alternate language as you think appropriate to better address their concerns. Please share your suggested rewrite with Dale for his review. As you are aware, brevity is important for the PP.

b. Work with Dale to go through the PP and figure out where we may be able to further emphasize



the importance of efforts to reduce or eliminate AMD as opposed to just doing long-term treatment. Dale commented that he would like to see us further define for the reader that "a combination of reducing acid water generation (mitigations program) combined with treatment is the only logical approach."

c. Dale indicates that "I am concerned that the presentation and discussion of the components of AMD management and the alternatives are too brief and will largely confuse rather than educate the reader. We need to clearly describe the trades between reducing AMD production (the mitigation) versus simply building a large treatment plant that will be operated forever." We need to keep in mind a couple of things: 1) the PP is by nature "a summary" and is not meant to be a detailed "technical" document; 2) it would be frowned upon if the document grew beyond its current size (about 20 pages), in fact, I have been asked to shorten it; and 3) the reader is referred to the RI/FS for more detailed information. But, I would like you and Dale to work together to review the "Summary of Remedial Alternatives" and "Evaluation of Alternatives" sections and see what you can do to consolidate information, highlight the most important elements, and remove those items that may not be critical for the reader to know. This would be a great help to me! In addition, Bill and Nick both suggested that some information about the options we considered and screened out would be useful. Would you work with Dale to propose a short (brief) technology screening section? We may be able to fit it in the PP if we can cut from other areas (e.g., the evaluation of alternatives sections).

d. Dale suggests that the phasing approach of alternatives 3 and 4 is not adequately described. In addition, Chuck and Nick noted that the difference between alternatives 3 and 4 is not clear. Please work together to propose alternative language where appropriate. Perhaps we need to spell out the three tiers of alternatives (1- those with best chance for success, 2- those that provide an element of safety, and 3- those that are estimated to provide less water reduction than tier 1 mitigations and require tier one mitigations to be in place to implement). We may also want to emphasize what estimates of water reduction are based on, and clearly let the reader know that data is needed to assess their effectiveness.